



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,250	01/15/2004	Douglas Melton Carper	121497 (07783-0172)	6395

31450 7590 04/11/2007
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC
100 PINE STREET
P.O. BOX 1166
HARRISBURG, PA 17108-1166

EXAMINER

MAYES, MELVIN C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1734

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/758,250

Applicant(s)

CARPER ET AL.

Examiner

Melvin Curtis Mayes

Art Unit

1734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-16 and 18-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

(1)

Claims 13-16 and 18-20 are objected to because of the following informalities: the claims should read "silicon-silicon carbide composite preform" to be consistent with "silicon-silicon carbide composite preform" claimed in Claims 12 and 17. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

(2)

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

(3)

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Steibel et al. 6,280,550 in view of JP 6-137103 and the admitted prior art.

Steibel et al. 6,280,550 discloses a method of making a composite turbine blade comprising: providing first reinforcement comprising an insert preform of silicon carbide fabric rigidized by deposited silicon carbide (silicon carbide-silicon carbide composite preform having porosity); optionally depositing matrix material to fill only a portion of the porosity of the insert preform (silicon-silicon carbide composite preform having some porosity); providing second reinforcement comprising silicon carbide fabric plies (outer shell section preform); applying the silicon carbide fabric plies to contact the insert and define the surface shape of the blade; and

depositing matrix material into the porosity of the first and second reinforcement, the depositing also providing bonding between the first and second reinforcements. Matrix material may be deposited by melt infiltration of silicon so that the matrix is silicon carbide or mixture of silicon and silicon carbide (col. 2-7). Steibel et al. do not disclose providing the composite turbine blade with a dovetail section by inserting an insert preform in the dovetail section.

JP 6-137103 teaches that a fiber reinforced composite turbine blade, such as of fiber strengthening ceramic (ceramic matrix composite), is made with a dovetail section using reinforcing fiber which extends from the dovetail section to the blade part (Abstract and computer translation).

The admitted prior art teaches that to manufacture thick dovetail sections of turbine engine components using ceramic matrix composites, preform inserts are used in the dovetail section to build up the thicknesses [0004].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Steibel et al. for making a composite turbine blade by making the turbine blade with a dovetail section, as taught by JP '103 as provided as part of a turbine blade and also made during the fabrication of a fiber reinforced composite blade. Providing the fabric plies (outer shell section preform) to extend from the blade part to a dovetail section to form both the blade and dovetail section of a turbine blade in one step of matrix deposition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as JP '103 teaches that the reinforcing fiber for a turbine blade extends from the blade to the dovetail section.

Providing an insert preform in the dovetail section would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as the admitted prior art teaches that preform inserts are used in the

Art Unit: 1734

dovetail section to build up the thickness. Providing the insert preform in the dovetail section as silicon carbide fabric rigidized by deposited silicon carbide (silicon carbide-silicon carbide composite preform having porosity), or silicon-silicon carbide composite preform having some porosity, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the insert preform in the dovetail section similar to that provided in the blade section to allow for deposition of matrix by silicon melt infiltration, as disclosed by Steibel et al.

Further, by providing a second reinforcement of silicon carbide fabric plies for defining the surface shape of the blade and into which silicon can be deposited by melt infiltration, an outer shell preform having at least some porosity is obviously provided.

(4)

Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steibel et al. 6,280,550 in view of JP 6-137103, the admitted prior art and Steibel et al. 6,258,737.

Steibel et al. 6,280,550 discloses a method of making a composite turbine blade comprising: providing first reinforcement comprising an insert preform of silicon carbide fabric rigidized by deposited silicon carbide (silicon carbide-silicon carbide composite preform having porosity); optionally depositing matrix material to fill only a portion of the porosity of the insert preform (silicon-silicon carbide composite preform having some porosity); providing second reinforcement comprising silicon carbide fabric plies (preform); applying the silicon carbide fabric plies to contact the insert preform and define the surface shape of the blade; and depositing matrix material into the porosity of the first and second reinforcement, the depositing also providing bonding between the first and second reinforcements. Matrix material may be deposited by melt infiltration of silicon so that the matrix is silicon carbide or mixture of silicon

Art Unit: 1734

and silicon carbide. As shown in Figure 7, the insert is provided in the dovetail section of the blade (col. 2-7). Steibel et al. do not specifically disclose providing the second reinforcement as plies of silicon carbide prepreg cloth or disclose providing the composite turbine blade with a dovetail section by inserting a insert preform in the dovetail section.

JP 6-137103 teaches that a fiber reinforced composite turbine blade, such as of fiber strengthening ceramic (ceramic matrix composite), is made with a dovetail section using reinforcing fiber which extended from the dovetail section to the blade part (Abstract and computer translation).

The admitted prior art teaches that to manufacture thick dovetail sections of turbine engine components using ceramic matrix composites, preform inserts are used in the dovetail section to build up the thicknesses [0004].

Steibel et al. '737 teaches that in making a silicon carbide composite by melt infiltration with silicon, the silicon carbide fiber fabric is impregnated with high char yield slurry to form a prepreg before melt infiltration. The use of a high char yielding resin improves increases burn-out strength, produces a hard, tough preform and provides integrity to the preform structure during silicon melt infiltration. Steibel et al. further teach that before melt infiltration, the impregnated fabric (prepregged cloth) is either subjected to compression molding, bladder molding or autoclaving to form a preform for melt infiltration. Steibel et al. also teach that carbon of micrometer particle size provided in silicon carbide preforms to give different composite properties of structure (col. 5, line 50 – col. 6, line 11, col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the method of Steibel et al. for making a composite turbine blade by making the turbine blade with a

Art Unit: 1734

dovetail section, as taught by JP '103 as provided as part of a turbine blade and also made during the fabrication of a fiber reinforced composite blade. Providing the fabric plies (outer shell section preform) to extend from the blade part to a dovetail section to form both the blade and dovetail section of a turbine blade in one step of matrix deposition would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as JP '103 teaches that the reinforcing fiber for a turbine blade extends from the blade to the dovetail section.

Providing an insert preform in the dovetail section would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as the admitted prior art teaches that preform inserts are used in the dovetail section to build up the thickness. Providing the insert preform in the dovetail section as silicon carbide fabric rigidized by deposited silicon carbide (silicon carbide-silicon carbide composite preform having porosity), or silicon-silicon carbide composite preform having some porosity, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the insert preform in the dovetail section similar to that provided in the blade section to allow for deposition of matrix by silicon melt infiltration, as disclosed by Steibel et al.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have further modified the method of Steibel et al. for making a composite turbine blade by providing the second reinforcement as impregnated with high char yielding slurry (prepregged or a preform) before contacting the insert preform, as taught by Steibel et al. '737, as impregnated in silicon carbon fiber fabric before silicon melt infiltration to increase burn-out strength, produce a hard, tough preform and provide integrity during silicon melt infiltration.

Autoclaving the assembly of second reinforcement prepreg and insert preform before silicon melt infiltration, as claimed in Claim 12, would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 1734

skill in the art, as taught by Steibel et al. '737, to aid in forming the prepreg into preform shape before melt infiltration. It would have been obvious to have autoclaved to help shape the prepregged plies into the surface shape of the blade.

Providing the silicon-silicon carbide insert preform with carbon microspheres, as claimed in Claims 14 and 19, would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, as taught by Steibel et al. '737, as added to silicon carbide preforms to give different composite properties of structure. The use of carbon microspheres in either of the insert preform or second reinforcement preform would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art depending on desired composite properties of the insert or the surface of the composite turbine blade.

Response to Arguments

(5)

Applicant's arguments filed January 30, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claimed limitations of providing a core insert section and assembling are not taught nor obvious from the combined art. Applicant argues that the Examiner's statements are nothing less than hindsight reconstruction in that Steibel et al. '550 uses preforms in the vane portion of a turbine component and is silent to a dovetail section of a blade and JP '103, the admitted prior art and Steibel et al. '737 do not cure the deficiencies of Steibel et al. '550.

(6)

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In this case the use of silicon-silicon carbide composite preform or silicon carbide-silicon carbide composite preform in combination with silicone carbide fabric preform for making a composite turbine blade is known as disclosed by Steibel et al. '550. Providing composite turbine blades with a dovetail section and using the same fiber as used in the blade part is suggested by JP '103, thus suggesting to use the fabric preform to not only make the blade part but also a dovetail part for the turbine blade in the method of Steibel et al. Insert preforms used in the thick dovetail section of turbine blades is known as taught by the admitted prior art. The references in combination suggest that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have provided the composite turbine blade of Steibel not only with a dovetail section and but to also have provided insert preforms in this dovetail section. The Examiner's position is that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the same type of insert preforms in the dovetail section as those used in the blade section of Steibel et al.

Conclusion

(7)

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


(8)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvin Curtis Mayes whose telephone number is 571-272-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Fiorilla can be reached on 571-272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1734

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Melvin Curtis Mayes
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1734

MCM
April 9, 2007